PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
425 Eye Street N.W.
BCIS, AAO, 3rd Floor, 3/F
Washington, D.C. 20536

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: Miami Date: AUG 26 2003

IN RE: Applicant: [redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Permanent Residence Pursuant to Section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act of November 2, 1966 (P.L. 89-732)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[redacted]

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (Bureau) where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. *Id.*

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of $110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Acting District Director, Miami, Florida, who certified his decision to the Administrative Appeals Office for review. The decision by the acting district director is affirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Honduras who filed this application for adjustment of status to that of a lawful permanent resident under section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act (CAA) of November 2, 1966. This Act provides, in pertinent part:

> [T]he status of any alien who is a native or citizen of Cuba and who has been inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959 and has been physically present in the United States for at least one year, may be adjusted by the Attorney General, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien makes an application for such adjustment, and the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to the spouse and child of any alien described in this subsection, regardless of their citizenship and place of birth, who are residing with such alien in the United States.

The acting district director determined that the applicant did not qualify for adjustment of status because her spouse's application for permanent residence under section 1 of the CAA had been denied. The acting district director, therefore, denied the application.

The applicant has provided no statement or additional evidence on notice of certification.

The record reflects that on December 1, 2001, at Miami, Florida, the applicant married [redacted] a native and citizen of Cuba. Based on that marriage, on May 9, 2002, the applicant filed for adjustment of status under section 1 of the CAA.

The Board, in *Matter of Quijada-Coto*, 13 I&N Dec. 740 (BIA 1971), held that adjustment of status to that of a permanent resident pursuant to the provisions of the Act of November 2, 1966, is not available to the spouse of an alien described in section 1 of the Act, where the alien himself has been denied adjustment of status under the Act.

The acting district director, in this case, denied the application after determining that the applicant's Cuban spouse [redacted] was denied permanent residence under section 1 of the CAA on September 21, 2002, because he failed to appear for a scheduled Service interview on July 23, 2002, or to provide the Service a satisfactory reason for his absence. Although [redacted] was advised that he may file a motion to reopen within 30 days of the acting district director's decision, there is no evidence in the record that a motion was filed.

Accordingly, the applicant is ineligible for adjustment of status to permanent residence, pursuant to section 1 of the Act of November 2, 1966. The applicant was offered an opportunity to submit

evidence in opposition to the acting district director's findings. No additional evidence has been entered into the record. The decision of the acting district director to deny the application will be affirmed.

ORDER: The acting district director's decision is affirmed.